

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,111	KIL ET AL.	
	Examiner George R. Evanisko	Art Unit 3762	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

(1) George R. Evanisko. (3) _____.

(2) Derrick Reed. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 May 2008 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/George R Evanisko/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The oath/declaration filed on 1/30/08 changed the order of inventor names. The oath was filed in response to the notice of allowance indicating a defective oath due to the "duty to disclose" statement. Director Dudas sent a memo of 1/22/08 clarifying that we would accept the old oaths. Therefore, the original oath is to be used, and the new oath of 1/30/08 is not to be used (and the change of order of names is incorrect)..